

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA WESTERN DIVISION

 THR CALIFORNIA, L.P.,

v.

Plaintiff,

VIRGINIA D. THOMPSON, et al.,

Defendants.

No. CV 13-06589-UA (VBK)

ORDER SUMMARILY REMANDING IMPROPERLY-REMOVED ACTION

The Court will remand this "Complaint for Unlawful Detainer (Limited Jurisduction Demand is Under \$10,000.00)", Case No. 13L00199, to state court summarily because Defendant removed it improperly.

On September 9, 2013, Defendant Noel Joe, who is not a named party in what appears to be a routine unlawful detainer action in California state court, lodged a Notice Of Removal of that action to this Court and also presented an application to proceed <u>in forma pauperis</u>. The Court has denied the latter application under separate cover because the action was not properly removed. To prevent the action from remaining in jurisdictional limbo, the Court issues this Order to remand the action to state court.

Simply stated, Plaintiff could not have brought this action in federal court in the first place, in that Defendant does not

competently allege facts supplying either diversity or federal-question jurisdiction, and therefore removal is improper. 28 U.S.C. § 1441(a); see Exxon Mobil Corp v. Allapattah Svcs., Inc., 545 U.S. 546, 563, 125 S.Ct. 2611, 162 L.Ed.2d 502 (2005). Even if complete diversity of citizenship exists, the amount in controversy does not exceed the diversity-jurisdiction threshold of \$75,000. See 28 U.S.C. §§ 1332, 1441(b). On the contrary, the unlawful-detainer complaint recites that the amount in controversy does not exceed \$10,000.

Nor does Plaintiff's unlawful detainer action raise any federal legal question. See 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1441(b).

Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that (1) this matter be REMANDED to the Superior Court of California, Los Angeles County, Southwest Division, 825 Maple Avenue, Torrance, California 90503 for lack of subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1447(c); (2) that the Clerk send a certified copy of this Order to the state court; and (3) that the Clerk serve copies of this Order on the parties.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: 9/16/19

HONORABLE GEORGE H. KING CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE